

Remarks

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the application. The Office has rejected Claims 1, 5, 7-9 and 13 and has objected to Claims 2-4, 6, 10-12 and 14.

The Office has rejected Claims 1, 5, 7-9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0061710 (Messing, et al.). The Office states that all elements of the claim are disclosed by or suggested thereby. In response, the Applicants have amended Claims 1, 5 and 8 to add the limitation that the consideration area, which is an area processed by the scaling filter in the input image, be a rhombus-shaped consideration area. As stated in the Response to the previous Office Action, Messing et al. only teaches a method for improving display resolution wherein the display apparatus has a striped topology. Messing et al. does not teach or suggest a display apparatus in which a pixel is formed with a delta-structured sub-pixel topology, as recited in newly-amended Claims 1, 5 and 8. Although the “delta-structure sub-pixel topology” language only appears in the preamble of unamended Claims 1, 5 and 8, the Applicants have amended those claims to include a limitation that the consideration area be rhombus-shaped, which is only applicable to display devices having a delta-structured sub-pixel topology. The Applicant directs the Office's attention to page 7 of the present application, lines 1-7 which state as follows:

[S]ince the delta-structured sub-pixels cause more color fringes in a straight line boundary in the vertical direction, the value of an input pixel in the horizontal direction should have a bigger weighted value in determining sub-pixel values than that in the vertical direction. *Accordingly, the mask shape of the scaling filter which determines the value of a sub-pixel appropriate to the delta structure is a rhombus shape in which the horizontal axis is longer than the vertical axis as expressed by solid lines in FIG. 6.*

(emphasis added). *See also* FIG. 6. The Applicants respectfully submit that Messing et al. does not teach a rhombus-shaped consideration area because the rhombus-shaped consideration area is only appropriately used when dealing with a display device having a delta-structured sub-pixel topology, whereas Messing et al. teaches a striped sub-pixel topology. As a result, the Applicants believe that the rejection of Claims 1, 5 and 8 has been traversed by the amendments thereto and request that the Office reconsider those claims and withdraw the rejections based on these amendments and remarks.

The Applicants appreciate the Office's acknowledgement that Claims 2-4, 6, 10-12 and 14 contain allowable subject matter and further submit that those claims should now be patentable as being dependent upon parent claims that are also patentable. However, the Applicants reserve the right to modify the objected to claims to include the limitations of their parent claims without the "rhombus-shaped" limitation, as the Office has already indicated that those claims are allowable without that limitation.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all currently pending claims in light of the amendments above and the remarks following and requests allowance of all claims at the earliest possible time.

It is believed that this Response and Amendment requires no fee. However, if a fee is required for any reason, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-4553 the necessary amount.

Should the Office have any questions regarding these amendments or arguments, the Applicant requests that the Office contact the Applicant's attorney, listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dennis M. Carleton
Registration No. 40,938
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL, P.C.
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219-1410
(412) 562-1895

Attorney for Applicant